DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 036 HE 003 342

TITLE General Report on the Program Priorities Survey of Maryland Public Higher Educators.

INSTITUTION Maryland State Teachers Association, Baltimore. Higher Education Council.

PUB DATE [72]

NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; Educational Improvement; Faculty Promotion; *Higher Education; *Professional Associations; *Professors; Student Teacher Ratio; Teacher Welfare; Tenure

ABSTRACT

This document presents the results of a survey that was conducted by the Higher Education Council of the Maryland State Teachers Association to determine the professional priorities of the institutions within the State and the priorities of their faculty. The sample surveyed includes faculty in all rank and administrators at the state colleges, community colleges and the University of Maryland. Several significant results of the survey are: (1) Only 38% of the respondents belonged to a national association, which indicates that there is far less membership involvement in professional associations than had previously been assumed. (2) The prime area of interest in priority ranking is the need for professional negotiations services followed by climate of learning and student personnel programs as well as curriculum and course improvement programs. There was very low interest shown in programs dealing with the organization and administration of higher education and in research services. (3) The key issues in professional negotiations are: tenure policies and procedures, promotion policies, student/faculty ratio policies, faculty participation in college governance, availability of fringe benefits, and faculty participation in curriculum development. (HS)

HIGHER EDUCATION COUNCIL

MARYLAND STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION
344 NORTH CHARLES STREET • BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21201 • TELEPHONE 727-7676

MILSON C. RAVER
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

OSCAR C. JENSEN
ASSOCIATE FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION

ED 067036

June 15, 1972

Dear Sir:

Thank you for your kind request of the report of our survey.

The enclosed shows the analysis of the survey results. We hope you will find it suitable to your needs.

Sincerely,

Oscar C. Jensen

Oscar C. Jensen
Associate

OCJ/lvj

Enclosure

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 342

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 067036

# GENERAL REPORT ON THE PROGRAM PRIORITIES SURVEY OF MARYLAND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATORS

The Higher Education Council of the Maryland State Teachers Association has completed a program and structure analysis of the Council's activities. The evaluation which has taken place was developed following the favorable reaction of the MSTA Executive Board to an evaluation of the Higher Education Council, which would give any indication of future program direction. This general report is based on the Survey of Maryland Public Higher Educators.

The survey was based on a 10% random sample of the higher educators in Maryland's public colleges and universities. The survey instrument was developed by the Higher Education Council. Both the instrument and the use and control of the findings are statistically accurate. Data have been compiled for each separate higher education institution, for the three types of higher education institutions (community colleges, four-year colleges, and the University), and for the whole. The following results are reported on the whole data.

A copy of the survey instrument is attached to this report with the results of the whole data.

## THE SURVEY

The survey was sent to 746 (10%) of the public higher educators in Maryland. The number of persons that responded were 403 (54%) of the sample group. The following chart defines the respondents by rank and position on campus.

### CHART I
### STRATIFICATION DATA

A. Numbers Surveyed and Responded

| | Surveyed | Responded | Percent Responded |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total of All | 746 | 403 | 54% |
| Administrators | 58 | 38 | 66% |
| State Colleges | 114 | 65 | 57% |
| Community Colleges | 172 | 97 | 56% |
| University | 460 | 241 | 52% |

B. Rank Designation of Respondents

| | |
|---|---|
| Professors | 72 |
| Associate Professors | 92 |
| Assistant Professors | 117 |
| Instructors | 50 |
| Administrators | 38 |
| Others | 3 |

HE 005 342

Of the respondents, one-third of the higher educators belonged to the American Association of University Professors; 10% belonged to NEA. Only 38% of the total belonged to any state or national professional higher education association. (12% belonged to two or more.)

Each respondent was requested to rank eight (8) program priorities. The following chart indicates the cumulative results of that ranking divided into the various classifications of the higher education community.

CHART II
PROGRAM PRIORITY RANKING

| | SC[1] Rank | CC[2] Rank | UM[3] Rank | ADM[4] Rank | Total Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic and Professional Publication Services | 8 | 7 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| Academic Freedom Provisions, Program & Services | 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 4 |
| Climate of Learning & Student Personnel Programs | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Curriculum and Course Improvement Programs | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| Legislative Activities Services | 5 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 5 |
| Negotiations Services | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| Organization & Administration of Higher Education | 6 | 6 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| Research Services | 7 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The higher educators responded to their membership in academic organizations by indicating that they belonged to an average of 2.32 national academic organizations each. On the average, they belong to less than 1 per person, (.64%), state-wide academic organizations.

The respondents were asked to check five (5) areas of concern on their campus. These checks were quantified and ranked as to their importance, using the total number of checks per item, plus the total number of responses where there were two checks (which indicated a strong concern). Chart III gives the rankings assigned.

CHART III
CAMPUS CONCERNS RANKING

| | SC[1] Rank | CC[2] Rank | UM[3] Rank | ADM[4] Rank | Total Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parking Facilities | 10 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Student/Faculty Ratio | 7 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 2 |
| Tenure Policies and Procedures | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| Administrative Rank | 12 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 13 |
| Sabbatical Leave Provisions | 6 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| General Leave Provisions | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| Promotion Policies | 1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| Office Facilities & Secretarial Services | 11 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 |
| Availability of Travel Funds | 2 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 |
| Faculty Participation in College Governance | 9 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Availability of Fringe Benefits | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Present Retirement System Provisions | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| Faculty Participation in Curriculum Determination | 8 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 6 |

The concerns of the higher educators over their salaries showed, that 120 (approximately 1/3 of the respondents) felt that the salary schedules were adequate and that 235 felt these were inadequate. Two hundred seventy seven (277) respondents felt that the merit concept was acceptable while 65 felt that this was inadequate.

The final area surveyed was the concerns of the faculty over eight potential areas of state higher education legislation. Over 70% of the respondents felt that increased retirement benefits were good, an optional retirement system was good, and

1. SC - State Colleges
2. CC - Community Colleges
3. UM - University of Maryland
4. ADM- Administrative Personnel (These totals are included in the three other classifications and are presented as a cumulative total to indicate any general differences.)

that fiscal autonomy for public higher education was good. A majority of the respondents also felt that faculty-administration accountability was bad, professional negotiations were good, and student financial assistance should be restructured.

## THE SURVEY RESULTS

There were several significant results of this survey. The following are based on the responses to matched questions:

1. Only 38% of the respondents belonged to a national association. (12% belonged to two or more). The 62% of non-affiliated responses strengthen the assumption that the higher educator does not join a professional association. The average of 2.32 national and .64 state-wide academic associations (shown in answers to Section 3A and B) shows far less membership involvement in academic associations than had been previously assumed.

2. The prime area of interest in priority ranking shown in Section 2B and in Section 4A, is the need for Professional Negotiations Services (including legality for the process). Next, in order of precedence, are the need for services in Climate of Learning and Student Personnel Programs, and in Curriculum and Course Improvement Programs. There was very low interest shown in programs dealing with the Organization and Administration of Higher Education, and in Research Services. The low ranking of Legislative Services indicates a change of significance in the professional associations' programs.

3. The key areas of need in the Professional Negotiations area are:

   Tenure Policies and Procedures
   Promotion Policies
   Student/Faculty Ratio Policies
   Faculty Participation in College Governance
   Availability of Fringe Benefits
   Faculty Participation in Curriculum Determination

4. Salary and Fringe Benefits are issues of importance, not in how they are administered, but in the amounts available.

SURVEY OF FACULTY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

FINAL TOTALS

ALL SURVEYS

1. Total Survey Potential 746

2. Total Survey Returns 403 Percentage of Returns 54%

3. Total Administrators 58 - 38 Percentage of Returns 66%
(Administrators are listed in the totals shown in #1 and #2 above.)

1. Position or Rank

72 Professor
92 Associate Professor
117 Assistant Professor
50 Instructor
38 Administration
-- No Rank Available at Institution
3 Other - Please Specify

2. Professional Associations

A. Please check the professional association (s) to which you belong, if any.

22 AAHE
131 AAUP
8 AFT - College Division
31 NEA-NHEA
Others - Please Specify 209 Responses - average of 2.19 other associations

B. Each of the organizations above has developed a series of program priorities. Please give your ranking of the following list of priorities using 1 as the first priority.

Ranking - See Chart Attached

6 Academic and Professional Publication Services
4 Academic Freedom Provisions, Programs, and Services
2 Climate of Learning and Student Personnel Programs
3 Curriculum and Course Improvement Programs
5 Legislative Activities Services
1 Negotiations Services on Salary, Fringe Benefits, Economic Benefits, and Conditions of Employment
8 Organization and Administration of Higher Education Programs and Services
7 Research Services

3. Academic Organizations

A. National Academic Organizations
___ How many national academic organizations do you belong to?
What specific service do these organizations render that is of prime importance to you? 283 Responses - average of 2.32 national organizations

B. State-wide Academic Organizations
___ How many state-wide academic organizations do you belong to? What specific service do these organizations render that is of prime importance to you? 283 responses average of .64 state-wide organizations.

4. Faculty Concerns

A. The Campus

Please check five of the following areas which you feel are of concern to you. A double check will indicate a strong concern.

| Ranking | | Total Checks | Two Checks |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | Parking Facilities | 75 | 9 |
| 2 | Student-Faculty Ratio | 192 | 49 |
| 1 | Tenure Policies and Procedures | 218 | 52 |
| 13 | Administrative Rank | 56 | 10 |
| 10 | Sabbatical Leave Provisions | 125 | 16 |
| 12 | General Leave Provisions | 58 | 2 |
| 2 | Promotion Policies | 192 | 61 |
| 9 | Office Facilities and Secretarial Services | 138 | 21 |
| 8 | Availability of Travel Funds | 150 | 19 |
| 7 | Faculty Participation in College Governance | 161 | 41 |
| 5 | Availability of Fringe Benefits | 176 | 43 |
| 2 | Present Retirement System Provisions | 192 | 49 |
| 6 | Faculty Participation in Curriculum Determination | 175 | 49 |

B. Salary Concerns

Is the present salary schedule an adequate schedule?

120 Yes
234 No

Should the merit concept continue as a salary basis?

277 Yes
65 No

C. State Concerns

The governor and state legislature play key roles in the affairs of higher education. The following items could be considered by the state this year. Please rate each issue as good (G), bad (B), or inconsequential (I), as it might effect you.

Increased Retirement Benefits in Present State System

286 G 19 B 56 I

Optional Retirement Provisions - State Funding of Other Systems

244 G 25 B 85 I

Faculty and Administration Accountability - Work Hour Mandated

87 G 194 B 65 I

Professional Negotiations for Higher Education

172 G 56 B 85 I

Restructuring of Student Financial Assistance

190 G 17 B 136 I

Aid to Private Higher Education

130 G 95 B 116 I

Restructuring of State Governance of Higher Education under a "Super" Board

61 G 122 B 70 I

Fiscal Autonomy for Public Higher Education Institutions

246 G 28 B 53 I

GRAND TOTAL OF ALL
PROGRAM PRIORITY RANKING
FREQUENCY OF RANKING

| Questions | No. of Rankings 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | No. Total Responses To Each Question |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 27 | 21 | 25 | 27 | 24 | 34 | 42 | 42 | 242 |
| 2. | 55 | 45 | 42 | 31 | 22 | 23 | 25 | 10 | 253 |
| 3. | 43 | 56 | 49 | 38 | 26 | 10 | 14 | 3 | 239 |
| 4. | 70 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 27 | 19 | 12 | 7 | 250 |
| 5. | 14 | 29 | 33 | 30 | 33 | 29 | 32 | 24 | 224 |
| 6. | 86 | 50 | 29 | 31 | 29 | 13 | 11 | 16 | 265 |
| 7. | 5 | 25 | 31 | 25 | 33 | 38 | 24 | 37 | 218 |
| 8. | 15 | 36 | 24 | 21 | 22 | 29 | 36 | 49 | 232 |